

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. The above listing of the claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 2, 11 and 15-20 under 35 USC § 102(e), as being anticipated by Subramanion et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 has been amended in a manner which distinguishes over the disclosure of Subramanion et al. Support for these claim amendments is found on at least page 7, line 30 – page 8, line 30, for example.

More specifically, Subramanion et al. does not disclose forming an anti-reflective coating after a HMDS treatment and does not disclose either a reflectance R or a complex index of refraction of the anti-reflective coating as now required by claim 15.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The rejections of claims 2, 11 and 15-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padmanaban in view of Subramanion et al.; Fujie et al., in view of Subramanion et al.; Padmanaban in view of Subramanion et al. and further in view of Matsuo et al.; or Fujie et al., Subramanion et al. and further in view of Matsuo et al., are all respectfully traversed. All of the features of amended claim 15, are not obtained by the combination of the cited reference combinations.

Neither Padmanaban nor Fujie et al. disclose or suggest forming an anti-reflective coating after a HMDS treatment, nor disclose or suggest a reflectance R or an anti-reflective coating complex index of refraction as now required by the claims. Matsuo et al. likewise does not disclose forming an anti-reflective coating after a HMDS treatment, and further is such as to teach a coating that has a low refractive index and a high transparency.

Therefore, in the event that Matsuo's coating is applied as an anti-reflective coating as suggested in this office action, light which passes through the resist, will

pass through the low refractive index, high transparency coating, and light which is reflected from the substrate will pass through the coating onto the resist. Thus, Matsuo's coating will therefore not not act as an anti-reflective coating. Accordingly, disclosure/motivation which would lead toward the purportedly obvious combination is not established.

Conclusion

The claims as they currently stand in this application in light of the amendments set forth above, are submitted as being allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons advanced above. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is courteously solicited.

Date 12/08/2005
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Keith J. Townsend
Registration No. 40,358